UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/938,163	08/23/2001	Michael Meiresonne	MEI03 P-300	1287

277 7590 06/13/2007

PRICE HENEVELD COOPER DEWITT & LITTON, LLP
695 KENMOOR, S.E.
P O BOX 2567
GRAND RAPIDS, MI 49501

EXAMINER
NGUYEN, MERILYN P

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2163	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
06/13/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/938,163	MEIRESONNE, MICHAEL	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Merilyn P Nguyen	2163	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE *3* MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *13 March 2007*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-54* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-54* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on *23 April 2003* is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☒ Other: *Detailed Action*.

DETAILED ACTION

1. In response to the communication dated 03/13/2007, claims 1-54 are pending in this office action.

2. Application No. 10/421268 filed on April 23, 2003 is a continuation in part of this application.

Claim Objections

3. Claims 10, 13 are objected to because of the following informalities:

Regarding claim 10, the claim recites, "a second pre-selected supplier" and "a second supplier link" without a first pre-selected supplier and a fist supplier link.

Regarding claim 13, the claimed limitation appears as having the same limitation of claim 12.

Regarding claim 21, the claimed limitation appears as having the same limitation of claim 19.

Regarding claim 22, claimed limitation of claim 19 appears to include the limitation of this claim.

Regarding claims 36-47, the claimed limitation appears as having the same limitation of claim 34-35.

Regarding claim 48, the claimed limitation appears as having the same limitation of claim 37.

Appropriate correction is required.

Double Patenting

4. The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970);and, *In re Thorington,* 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

5. Claims 1-3, 19, 22, 24, 36, 49, 51 and 53 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1, 8 and 15 of copending Application No. 10/421,268. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because they are substantially similar in scope and they use the similar limitations.

Claims 1, 8, and 15 of '268 recite broader version of claim 19 of the instant application.

Claims 1, 8, and 15 of '268 contain(s) every element of claims 1-3, 22, 24, 36, 49, 51 and 53 of the instant application and thus anticipate the claims of the instant application. Claims of the instant application therefore are not patently distinct from the '268 and as such are unpatentable over obvious-type double patenting.

	10/421,268		Instant Application
Claims:	8	corresponding to	1+2+3
	1,8, 15		19, 22, 24, 36, 49, 51 and 53

6. This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

> The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

7. Claims 4, 19, 22, 24, 36, 49, and 53 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement.

Regarding claim 4, the claim contains subject matter, the term "user link", which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. Does Applicant mean "supplier link"?

Regarding claims 19, 22, 24, 36, 49, and 53, the phrase "a **tangible** storage medium" (emphasis added) was not described in the specification.

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

> The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

8. Claims 2, 11, 20, and 52 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Regarding claim 2, there is insufficient antecedent basis for "the domain name".

Regarding claim 11, the preamble of the claim recite "the following steps carried out by the user" which is vague and indefinite because how the steps in the body of the claim is carried out by the user. Also, the claim recites "at least in part on the class of goods or services" at lines 18-19 which does not provide a standard for ascertaining the requisite degree, and one of ordinary skill in the art would not be reasonably apprised of the scope of the invention.

Regarding claim 20, there is insufficient antecedent basis for "the directory Web site domain name".

Regarding claim 52, there is insufficient antecedent basis for "the links" and "the user selected supplier link". It's unclear what links the Applicant corresponds to "result link" or "supplier link" or both.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

9. Claims 1-6, 8-17, 22-34, 36-46, and 48-54 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rebane (US 6,662,192), in view of Fenton (US 2002/0194151).

Regarding claims 1 and 11, Rebane discloses a method to identify a supplier of goods or services over the Internet comprising:

accessing a home page/index page ("infomediary website", Fig. 17) having at least one link (PDAs link) to a directory Web site (Fig. 18) for a class of goods or services (pdas and pdas

suppliers) having a directory Web site address wherein a portion of the directory web site address describes the class of goods or services (Fig. 18, wherein although Fig. 18 does not show the directory Web site address, it is clearly teach that a portion of the directory web site address describes the class of goods or services, for example http://www.bitzate.com/pda_handheldcomputer/palmone-tungsten-e2-pd-pid304600136/compareprices.html[1]);

selecting a class of goods or services having a link to a selected directory Web site corresponding to the selected class of goods or services (See Fig. 17, when user click on PDAs link);

activating the link to a selected directory Web site corresponding to the selected class of goods or services, wherein a portion of the directory Web site address of the selected directory Web site defines the selected class of goods or services (See Fig. 18, the page show ups after user clicks on PDAs link, wherein although Fig. 18 does not show the directory Web site address, it is clearly teach that a portion of the directory web site address describes the class of goods or services, for example http://www.bitzate.com/pda_handheldcomputer/palmone-tungsten-e2-pd-pid304600136/compareprices.html[2]); and

wherein receiving a display (Fig. 18) of the selected directory Web site, wherein the selected directory Web site contains at least one supplier link (for example, ecost.com) to a corresponding supplier's Web site wherein the corresponding supplier offers the goods or service of the selected class of goods or services ((See page 32, line 57 to page 33, line 67).

---

[1] The Examiner attaches herein with the Office action an example from bitzate.com and the web site address is taken directly from there.
[2] The Examiner attaches herein with the Office action an example from bitzate.com and the web site address is taken directly from there.

Rebane further discloses activate the supplier link thereby launching a first supplier internet browser window and displaying the supplier's Web site or supplier information in the supplier internet browser window (See Fig. 20) and wherein the directory Web site remains displayed in a separate window[3] and wherein the supplier offers goods or services of the class of goods or services (See Fig. 20 and corresponding text) as per claim 11.

Rebane teaches information about the merchant could also be display or access through associated hyperlinks (See col. 32, lines 17-25); however, Rebane does not explicitly teach a rollover window wherein the rollover window conveys information about a supplier corresponding to the supplier link. On the other hand, Fenton teach a rollover window (See [0109], Fenton et al.). Because Fenton system use to index websites' content, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to incorporate a rollover window into the website of Rebane as suggested by Fenton. Fenton teaches rollover display box 838 describing the content item or provide other information to the user about the content item when the user rolls over the content item (See [0109], lines 4-7, Fenton et al.). Although the rollover display box 838 describes information related to multi-media, one having ordinary skill in the art would have recognized that written description in rollover display box can be a description of the supplier's goods or services; therefore, incorporating the rollover display box into the system of Rebane to display information about the supplier's goods or services, thus is well known and intended use. The motivation would have been providing useful information about suppliers to user so that user can decide whether to make further move.

---

[3] The Examiner attaches herein with the Office action an example from bitzate.com, wherein

Regarding claims 2, 3 and 14, Rebane/Fenton discloses the directory Web site further comprises a first paragraph of text comprising a description of the selected of class of goods or services ("Home>Computer Harward&Software>PDAs", Fig. 18, Rebane) and wherein the selected directory Web site further comprises a descriptive title portion substantially corresponding to the description of the selected class of goods or services described by the directory Web site address (Top BizRater PDA, Fig. 18, Rebane).

Regarding claims 4 and 6, Rebane/Fenton discloses pre-selecting a supplier by a user link thereby causing the rollover window to display information corresponding to a user selected supplier link as addressed above.

Regarding claims 5, 16, and 17, Rebane/Fenton discloses information about the merchant (supplier) could also be display or access through associated hyperlinks (See col. 32, lines 17-25), however, Rebane/Fenton is silent as to the selected directory Web site further comprises a supplier descriptive portion corresponding to the supplier located adjacent the corresponding supplier link. However, the difference are only found in the nonfunctional descriptive material and do not alter how the website creating function (i.e., one having ordinary skill in the art would recognized that one can build a web site with much information as one's desires). Thus, this descriptive material will not distinguish the claimed invention from the prior art in terms of patentability, *see In re Gulack*, 703 F.2d 1381, 217 USPQ 401, 404 (Fed. Cir. 1983); *In re Lowry*, 32

---

http://www.bitzate.com/pda_handheldcomputer/palmone-tungsten-e2-pd-pid304600136/compareprices.html having separate window with the supplier's website www.buydig.com.

F.3d 1579, 32 USPQ2d 1031 (Fed. Cir. 1994). Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to add a supplier descriptive portion corresponding to the supplier located adjacent the corresponding supplier link because adding additional information such as supplier descriptive portion to a web page does not alter how the web page creating functions and because the subjective interpretation of the additional information such as supplier descriptive portion does not patentably distinguish the claimed invention.

Regarding claim 15, Rebane/Fenton discloses wherein the directory Web site further comprises a link to the home page (home, Fig. 18).

Regarding claim 8, Rebane/Fenton discloses activating the supplier link for a supplier of a class of goods or services thereby launching a separate internet browser window and display the supplier Web site corresponding to the activated supplier link in the separate internet browser window (See Fig. 20) [4];

Rgarding claims 9-10, Rebane/Fenton discloses wherein the rollover window conveys information visually/audibly to the user and utilizes a script (See [0039], [0090], Fenton et al.) and further discloses the rollover window is positioned proximate the at least one supplier link; the rollover window displays information about a pre-selected supplier when a user pre-selects a supplier link; and the rollover window displays information about a second pre-selected supplier when a user pre-selects a second supplier link as addressed above.

Regarding claims 12 and 13, Rebane/Fenton discloses selecting a subsequent user determined supplier link for a subsequent supplier of goods or services; and activating the subsequent user determined supplier link to the corresponding user selected subsequent supplier Web site thereby launching a second supplier Internet browser window and displaying the subsequent supplier Web site in the second supplier internet browser window (See Fig. 20, Rebane).

Regarding claim 22, this claim contains all the claimed subject matter as set forth above in claims 1, 3, and 5, thus rejected as the same.

Regarding claim 23, Rebane/Fenton discloses wherein the rollover window utilizes a script (See [0039], [0090], Fenton et al.).

Regarding claims 24-25, 36-37 and 48, these claims contain all the claimed subject matter as set forth above in claims 1, 3, and 6, thus rejected as the same.

Regarding claims 26-27, and 38-39, Rebane/Fenton discloses wherein the directory web site comprises a first set of supplier links and a second set of supplier links (See Fig. 20, Rebane).

---

[4] The Examiner attaches herein with the Office action an example from bitzate.com, wherein

Regarding claims 28-29, and 40-41, Rebane/Fenton discloses wherein at least a portion of the first rollover window is visible when at least a portion of the first set of supplier links is visible (See [0090], Fenton et al.).

Regarding claims 30, 33-34, 42, and 45-46, Rebane/Fenton discloses wherein the directory Web site comprises a second rollover window (See [0090], [0109], Fenton et al.).

Regarding claims 31-32 and 43-44, Rebane/Fenton discloses a plurality of directory Web sites (See Fig. 18, Rebane), wherein each directory Web site contains at least one link to at least other directory Web site (See Fig. 18 and 20, Rebane).

Regarding claims 49-53, these claims contain all the claimed subject matter as set forth above in claims 19, and further discloses access a convention search engine; input a search strategy into the conventional search engine to search for a supplier of a user determined good or service; view ranked result links as analyzed by the conventional search engine's algorithm and displayed by the conventional search engine; and activate a ranked result link corresponding to the directory web site corresponding to the user inputted search strategy thereby allowing the user to access the directory web site corresponding to the user inputted search strategy. Please see col. 31, line 62 to col. 32, line 12, Rebane.

---

http://www.bitzate.com/pda_handheldcomputer/palmone-tungsten-e2-pd-pid304600136/compareprices.html having separate window with the supplier's website www.buydig.com.

Regarding claim 54, Rebane/Fenton discloses wherein the directory Web site further comprises a related directory Web site link to another one of the plurality of directory Web sites (See Figs. 18 and 20, Rebane et al.).

10. Claims 7, 18-21, 35, and 47 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rebane (US 6,662,192), in view of Fenton (US 2002/0194151), and further in view of Perkes (US 2002/0194601).

Regarding claims 7, 18, 35, and 47, Rebane/Fenton discloses all the claimed subject matter as set forth above, however Rebane/Fenton is silent as to wherein the directory Web site comprises at least one substantially descriptive metatag. On the other hand, Perkes teach descriptive metatag (See [0042], Perkes et al.). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to include descriptive metatag into the directory Web site of Rebane/Fenton. The motivation would have been to cover all possible related searches and increase the ranking archived as suggested by Perkes.

Regarding claims 19-21, this claim contains all the claimed subject matter as set forth above thus rejected as the same.

Response to Arguments

11. Applicant's arguments filed on 03/13/2007 with respect to claims 1-54 have been considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant's remarks regarding the provisional double patenting rejection are noted. However, absent a terminal disclaiming or amendment patentability differentiating the inventions, the rejection stands.

In response to applicant's argument, to combine the references, the examiner recognizes that obviousness can only be established by combining or modifying the teachings of the prior art to produce the claimed invention where there is some teaching, suggestion, or motivation to do so found either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art. See *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988) and *In re Jones*, 958 F.2d 347, 21 USPQ2d 1941 (Fed. Cir. 1992).

In response to applicant's argument that the examiner's conclusion of obviousness is based upon improper hindsight reasoning, it must be recognized that any judgment on obviousness is in a sense necessarily a reconstruction based upon hindsight reasoning. But so long as it takes into account only knowledge which was within the level of ordinary skill at the time the claimed invention was made, and does not include knowledge gleaned only from the applicant's disclosure, such a reconstruction is proper. See *In re McLaughlin*, 443 F.2d 1392, 170 USPQ 209 (CCPA 1971).

In this case, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art to modify the teachings of Rebane patent to include a rollover window as shown in Fenton. Rebane system collects, evaluates, presents data, and generates information relating to electronic commerce such as rating different merchandises suppliers so that the users can compare and decide which supplier (merchant) would provide best goods or services. Figure 18 shows various ratings of suppliers of goods or services and various links to suppliers' web sites. For example, when user

clicks on "Ecost.com" link of Figure 18, user is directed to that website (Fig. 20). Information about the supplier can be found when the user choose to click on the link "why eCost.com" (Fig. 20). Since the information about the suppliers of Rebane system can be found at each individual supplier's website, it would be more convenient if one having ordinary skill in the art would have been modified the teaching of Rebane to include a rollover window, as shown in Fenton, on the directory Web site of Fig. 18 so that the information about the suppliers can be displayed directly on a rollover window of directory Web site of Fig. 18 of Rebane instead of user have to access to each of individual supplier's Web site in order to read information about that supplier. Thus, it is obvious to combine the Fenton rollover display box with the Rebane patent. "Test of obviousness is not whether features of secondary reference may be bodily incorporated into primary reference's structure, nor whether claimed invention is expressly suggested in any one or all of references; rather, test is what combined teachings of references would have suggested to those of ordinary skill in art." In re Keller, Terry, and Davies, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981).

Applicant argues that Rebane does not disclose Fig. 18 of Rebane does not disclose a web site where selecting the supplier link for a supplier who offers good or services of the class of good or service defined by a portion of the directory Website address or where the supplier's goods or services relate to the defined or selected class of goods or services. In response to Applicant's argument, please see the rejection section addressed above.

Applicant argues that Rebane reference does not disclose a supplier descriptive portion which describes a supplier who offers goods or services of the defined or selected class of goods or services. The Examiner respectfully disagrees. As addressed above, Rebane/Fenton discloses information about the merchant (supplier) could also be display or access through associated

hyperlinks (See col. 32, lines 17-25), however, Rebane/Fenton is silent as to the selected directory Web site further comprises a supplier descriptive portion corresponding to the supplier located adjacent the corresponding supplier link. However, the difference are only found in the nonfunctional descriptive material and do not alter how the website creating function (i.e., one having ordinary skill in the art would recognized that one can build a web site with much information as one's desires). Thus, this descriptive material will not distinguish the claimed invention from the prior art in terms of patentability, *see In re Gulack*, 703 F.2d 1381, 217 USPQ 401, 404 (Fed. Cir. 1983); *In re Lowry*, 32 F.3d 1579, 32 USPQ2d 1031 (Fed. Cir. 1994). Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to add a supplier descriptive portion corresponding to the supplier located adjacent the corresponding supplier link because adding additional information such as supplier descriptive portion to a web page does not alter how the web page creating functions and because the subjective interpretation of the additional information such as supplier descriptive portion does not patentably distinguish the claimed invention.

Applicant please takes a moment to look at the Morgenthaler reference (US 2002/0032677) incorporated herein as prior art, especially fig. 16 and fig. 17. The reference describes the superpages.com website. Please browse the http://www.superpages.com (The Examiner cites the printouts of pages taken from the superpages web site for better review by Applicant). The supperpages homepage (yellow pages) shows different links to directory web sites, for example, user can click at TVs link to go the directory website contains links to the supplier web sites wherein a portion of the directory website address describes the class of goods or service (in this case TV, for example, http://www.superpages.com/yellowpages/C-TVs/PI-101565/S-AL/T-Birmingham/). The directory website,

http://www.superpages.com/yellowpages/C-TVs/PI-101565/S-AL/T-Birmingham/ includes a supplier link (for example, ShopBrite.com), a descriptive title portion (for example "Search Results for Birmingham TVs in Birmingham AL"), a supplier descriptive portion located adjacent to the supplier link (for example, "Looking for Hdtv Television Deals? We have them. Compare now".

Conclusion

12. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

13. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Morgenthaler US 2002/0032677 discloses method for creating, editing, and up0dating searchable graphical database and databases of graphical images and information and displaying graphical images from a searchable graphical database or databases in a sequential or slide show format.

14. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Merilyn P Nguyen whose telephone number is 571-272-4026.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Don Wong can be reached on 571-272-1834. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 571-273-8300 for regular communications and 703-746-7240 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-305-3900.

Merilyn Nguyen
05/31/2007

DON WONG
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100